

## Exhibit D

COOLEY LLP  
BOBBY GHAJAR (198719)  
(bghajar@cooley.com)  
COLETTE GHAZARIAN (322235)  
(cghazarrian@cooley.com)  
1333 2nd Street, Suite 400  
Santa Monica, California 90401  
Telephone: (310) 883-6400  
Facsimile: (310) 883-6500

MARK WEINSTEIN (193043)  
(mweinstein@cooley.com)  
KATHLEEN HARTNETT (314267)  
(khartnett@cooley.com)  
JUDD LAUTER (290945)  
(jlauter@cooley.com)  
3175 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130  
Telephone: (650) 843-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

*Counsel for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RICHARD KADREY, et al.,

## Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

V.

META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware corporation;

**Defendant.**

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S  
RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO  
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF  
INTERROGATORIES**

Trial Date: None  
Date Action Filed: July 7, 2023

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

Identify all Agreements between and among:

- a. You and anyone associated, affiliated, or having any connection with data used to train the Meta Language Models;
- b. You and directors and officers of Defendants or Related Entities with a more than five percent interest held by directors and officers of Defendants.

1     **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

2                 Meta incorporates by reference its objections and definitions above, including to the terms  
 3 “Meta Language Models,” “You,” and “Training Data.”

4                 As an initial matter, Meta objects to this Interrogatory because it consists of two  
 5 Interrogatories, which count toward Plaintiffs’ limit. In answering the Interrogatory, Meta does not  
 6 waive this objection.

7                 Meta objects to this Interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible as to the phrase  
 8 “any connection with data.” Meta is accordingly unable to respond to subpart (a) as written.

9                 Meta objects to this Interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible as to  
 10 “Defendants,” as Meta is the only named defendant in this case. Meta will interpret “Defendants”  
 11 to mean Meta (as construed above).

12                 Meta objects to this Interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible as to the term  
 13 “Related Entities,” which is capitalized as if it is defined when it is not. For purposes of this  
 14 response, Meta will construe “Related Entities” to mean entities owned by or sharing common  
 15 ownership with Meta.

16                 Meta objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome,  
 17 and disproportionate to the needs of the case and seeks information that is not relevant to the parties’  
 18 claims and defenses, in particular to the extent it seeks information concerning “all” such  
 19 agreements regardless of their subject matter having “any connection” with “data.” Meta will  
 20 construe subpart (a) to refer to formal, written agreements concerning licensing or acquisition of  
 21 training data for any Meta Language Model (as construed above). Meta will not respond to subpart  
 22 (b).

23                 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, and pursuant to the terms of the  
 24 Protective Order and the ESI Order, Meta responds as follows:

25                 Meta incorporates by reference its most recent SEC FORM DEF 14A, which identifies  
 26 individuals and companies with a beneficial interest of more than 5% of Meta’s publicly traded  
 27 stock. Meta will produce a copy of that document in its forthcoming production pursuant to Rule  
 28 33(d).

Pursuant to Rule 33(d), Meta will also conduct a reasonable search for and produce on a rolling basis documents sufficient to show any executed written agreements concerning licensing or acquisition of training datasets for any Meta Language Models (as construed above).

**INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

In order of corporate seniority, Identify by name and date all Your past and present directors, officers, and board members.

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

Meta incorporates by reference its objections and definitions above, including to the term “Your.”

Meta objects to the portion of this Interrogatory requiring Meta to list individuals by order of “corporate seniority,” as certain individuals may be of equivalent or otherwise indistinguishable seniority.

Meta objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case and seeks information that is not relevant to the parties’ claims and defenses, in particular to the extent it seeks information concerning all past and present directors, officers, and board members of Meta, irrespective of the time period relevant to Plaintiffs’ allegations, or the role of said individuals in the conduct at issue in Plaintiffs’ complaint, which concerns language models that were only recently released.

Meta will not respond to this Interrogatory. Meta instead refers Plaintiff to the Investor Relations (<https://investor.fb.com/home/default.aspx>) and Company Info (<https://about.meta.com/company-info/>) pages on its website, which contain information about present Meta leadership.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

In order of corporate seniority, Identify by name, job title, and date, all Persons, Including employees from other businesses, contractors, vendors, and other non-employees of Your business, previously and currently responsible for, or having oversight or control over the training, engineering, development, ethics, safety, or alignment of the Meta Language Models, and any iterations, versions, or variations thereof. Include in Your response: